

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated September 7, 2007 ("*Office Action*"). Claims 1-31 are pending, and the Examiner rejects all pending claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0082877 issued to Schiff et al. ("*Schiff*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0249684 issued to Karppinen ("*Karppinen*") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0212321 issued to Vance et al. ("*Vance*"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on the ground that *Schiff*, *Karppinen*, and *Vance*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the claims.

Consider Applicant's independent Claim 1, which recites:

- A method for dynamic service scheduling comprising:
 - identifying a template specifying a plurality of events;
 - determining a plurality of consumer descriptors;
 - accessing a remote service directory having service descriptors for each of a plurality of services;
 - filtering the services from the service directory based on the service descriptors, the events, and the consumer descriptors to determine potential ones of the services for fulfilling the events;
 - querying each of the potential services for additional service descriptors;
 - filtering the potential services based on the additional service descriptors, the events, and the consumer descriptors to determine selected ones of the services for fulfilling the events;
 - identifying service links for accessing the selected services;
 - modifying the template to associate the service links with the events;
 - determining whether each of the events in the template has an associated service link; and
 - when each of the events in the template has an associated service link, presenting the template for acceptance.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of and response to Applicant's previously submitted arguments. In response, Applicant more fully explains why the references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest: (1) both the claimed "events"

and the claimed “services” and (2) filtering the services to determine potential ones of the services and filtering the potential services to determine selected ones of the services. Also, Applicant respectfully submits that certain dependent claims include separately patentable limitations.

A. The proposed combination fails to teach or suggest both the claimed “events” and the claimed “services.”

Claim 1 requires “identifying a template specifying a plurality of events” and “filtering the services from the service directory based on the service descriptors, the events, and the consumer descriptors to determine potential ones of the services for fulfilling the events.” The proposed *Schiff-Karppinen-Vance* combination does not teach or suggest both the “events” and the “services” required by Claim 1.

As teaching these claimed aspects, the *Office Action* cites to *Schiff*, explaining:

Schiff discloses a template (Figure 8) which specifies a plurality of events (several itineraries which meet the descriptions and preferences chosen). Further, *Schiff* discloses for each cruise sailing, there are typically a wide variety of pricings, luxury levels, features, and/or available activities (0008). ... Moreover, *Schiff* discloses an activity database includes information about the activities in the cruise selling and booking system.

Office Action, p. 2. Accordingly, Applicant assumes that the *Office Action* points to: (1) the itineraries that satisfy a customer’s preferences to teach the claimed “events,” and (2) the activities available for each cruise to teach the claimed “services.”

Even if one assumes, for the sake of argument, that the *Office Action* is correct, *Schiff* still fails to teach or suggest “filtering the [activities available for each cruise] ... based on ... the [itineraries that satisfy a customer’s preferences],” as would be required by Claim 1. While *Schiff*’s system may identify cruises in response to a customer’s booking preferences and search criteria (*Schiff*, ¶ 100-01), *Schiff* fails to teach or suggest filtering the activities available on a cruise based on the cruises (*i.e.*, itineraries) that satisfy the customer’s preferences and criteria.

Claim 1 also requires “filtering the services ... to determine potential ones of the services for fulfilling the events.” However, *Schiff* fails to teach or suggest filtering anything to determine activities for fulfilling the cruises (*i.e.*, itineraries) that satisfy the customer’s preferences, as would be required by the claim. While *Schiff* teaches that each cruise sailing typically includes a variety of available activities (*id.* at ¶ 8), the cited portions of *Schiff* fail

to teach or suggest filtering those activities to determine cruise itineraries “for fulfilling” the activities. Accordingly, *Schiff* fails to teach or suggest “filtering the services ... to determine potential ones of the services for fulfilling the events,” as required by Claim 1.

Moreover, *Schiff* still fails to teach or suggest these claimed aspects even when different elements in *Schiff* are relied upon to teach the claimed “events” and “services.” Claim 1 requires “identifying a template specifying a plurality of events” where “the services [are filtered] . . . based on . . . [those] events.” The claim also requires “modifying the template to associate [] service links with the events” where “service links [are identified] for accessing the selected services.” The references, whether taken alone or in combination, simply fail to teach or suggest these claimed aspects. *Karppinen* and *Vance* fail to remedy the deficiencies of *Schiff*.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that *Schiff*, *Karppinen*, and *Vance*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of Claim 1. Likewise, independent Claims 11, 21, and 31 include limitations that, for substantially similar reasons, are not taught or suggested by the references. Because the proposed *Schiff-Karppinen-Vance* combination fails to teach or suggest every element of independent Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, and their respective dependent claims.

B. The proposed combination fails to teach or suggest filtering the services to determine potential ones of the services and filtering the potential services to determine selected ones of the services.

Claim 1 requires “filtering the services from the service directory based on the service descriptors, the events, and the consumer descriptors to determine potential ones of the services for fulfilling the events” **and** “filtering the potential services based on the additional service descriptors, the events, and the consumer descriptors to determine selected ones of the services for fulfilling the events.” The proposed *Schiff-Karppinen-Vance* combination does not teach or suggest these claimed aspects.

The *Office Action* fails to even allege that the latter of these claim phrases (*i.e.*, “filtering the potential services ... to determine selected ones of the services”) is taught or suggested by the references. *Office Action*, pp. 3-5. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest these claimed aspects.

As teaching the former claim phrase (*i.e.*, “filtering the services ... to determine potential ones of the services”) the *Office Action* points to *Schiff*, paragraphs 44, 100, and 101 and Figure 8. *Id.* at p. 4. In the cited paragraphs, *Schiff* describes portions of the “customer qualification process.” *Schiff*, ¶¶ 44, 92, 100-01. The customer qualification process includes a pre-qualification process, which collects booking preferences (*e.g.*, desired occupancy per cabin, preferred region of the world, specific destination, etc.) and additional search criteria (*e.g.*, degree of flexibility of preferences, special restrictions such as handicaps or food requests, special discounts, etc.). *Id.* at ¶¶ 100-01. Then, *Schiff* uses the obtained information to filter cruises from the cruise line database in order to determine select cruises that may be of interest to the customer. *Id.* at ¶ 105; *see also* Figures 5-7.

However, the cited portions of *Schiff* fail to disclose both “filtering the services ... to determine potential ones of the services” and “filtering the potential services ... to determine selected ones of the services,” as Claim 1 requires. Moreover, Claim 1 requires “querying each of the potential services for additional service descriptors” and “filtering the potential services based on the additional service descriptors.” These claimed aspects are simply not taught by *Schiff*. *Karppinen* and *Vance* fail to remedy the deficiencies of *Schiff*.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that *Schiff*, *Karppinen*, and *Vance*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of Claim 1. Likewise, independent Claims 11, 21, and 31 include limitations that, for substantially similar reasons, are not taught or suggested by the references. Because the proposed *Schiff-Karppinen-Vance* combination fails to teach or suggest every element of independent Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, and their respective dependent claims.

C. Dependent Claims 2, 12, and 22 include separately patentable limitations.

Consider, for example, dependent Claim 2, which recites:

The method of Claim 1, wherein for each of the potential services, the additional service descriptors comprise a plurality of interface descriptors each identifying a feature of the potential service and a format for interfacing with the feature.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Schiff*, *Karppinen*, and *Vance*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest these claimed aspects.

As teaching these claimed aspects, the *Office Action* points to *Schiff*, paragraphs 66, 100, and 101 and Figure 8. *Office Action*, p. 5. As explained above, in paragraphs 100 and 101, *Schiff* teach a pre-qualification process that collects a customer's booking preferences and additional search criteria. *Id.* at ¶¶ 100-01. In paragraph 66, *Schiff* notes that the cruise selling and booking component 220 may receive query results from various sources, process those results, and format the results for presentation to the user. *Id.* at ¶ 66.

These portions of *Schiff* fail to teach or suggest, at least, “a plurality of interface descriptors each identifying ... a format for interfacing with the feature,” as required by Claim 2. In the cited paragraphs, *Schiff* only includes the word “format” once -- “the cruise selling and booking component 220 ... formats the results for presentation to the user via the server component 210.” *Id.* at ¶ 66. However, *Schiff*'s formatting of query results for presentation to a user fails to teach or suggest “a plurality of interface descriptors each identifying ... a format for interfacing with the feature,” as is required by Claim 2. For at least this reason, *Schiff* fails to teach or suggest all aspects of Claim 2. *Karppinen* and *Vance* fail to remedy the deficiencies of *Schiff*.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that *Schiff*, *Karppinen*, and *Vance*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of Claim 2. Likewise, dependent Claims 12 and 22 include limitations that, for substantially similar reasons, are not taught or suggested by the references. Because the proposed *Schiff-Karppinen-Vance* combination fails to teach or suggest every element of independent Claims 2, 12, and 22, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 2, 12, and 22 and their respective dependent claims.

Moreover, while not expressly discussed, other dependent claims provide further patentable limitations. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these limitations and allowance of the claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of this Application. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of the Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Although no fees are believed to be currently due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K=P' followed by a long horizontal stroke.

Kurt M. Pankratz
Reg. No. 46,977
(214) 953-6584

Date: December 7, 2007

Customer Number: **05073**